

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In response to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Applicants amend the independent claims. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 4, now incorporated in the independent claims. The Examiner cites *In re Gulack* and *In re Lowry* to support the assertions that "...these differences are only found in the nonfunctional data stored on the article of manufacture. Data identifying the metadata, is not functionally related to the method. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish, the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. ... Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to allow the metadata to be any type as shown in *Berkeley* because such metadata does not functionally relate to the method and merely labeling the data differently from that in the prior art would have been obvious."

The rationale of this rejection is ill-founded. In contrast to *Gulack* and *Lowry*, the present invention is not dealing merely with data structures or printed indicia on a device. Instead, the invention as part of its functionality extracts particular portions of document data that are particularly useful to a user and utilizes the selected data for other aspects of its functionality. Specifically, the invention generates at least one of the results of a speaker change search, results of a stress analysis, results of a speech transcript search, audio features, audio amplitude data, and the number of accesses to a particular document segment to depict search term density distributions for a user. There is no "nonfunctional data stored on the article of manufacture"; the invention processes input documents in a graphical user interface. The invention extracts the metadata from the input documents; this is a functional aspect of the invention.

Regarding paragraph 6 and claims 18 and 20, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Liou teaches a system for providing a video directory including a video shot list and representative frames attached to a tree in chronological order for video editing. However, Liou and the other prior art cited, either separately or together, does not teach or suggest an enhancement including a hierarchy of representations or summary views as taught and claimed in the present invention.

All pending claims are believed to be allowable as amended. The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been carefully reviewed. The Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned representative if a telephone conference will expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Dieberger et al.

By Marc D. McSwain
Marc D. McSwain (#44,929)
Phone (408) 927-3364